

The present invention is related to an electro-optical device comprising at least two transistors provided on an insulating surface. In particular, the present invention claims the structure of Figs. 3 and 8 as described in the specification. Fig. 3, shows a device construction in which three thin film transistors are provided in parallel and provided in separate semiconductor islands. Fig. 8 shows a device construction in which three thin film transistors are connected in parallel and provided in a common semiconductor island. These constructions are advantageous for handling currents whose size is similar to thin film transistors that have an equivalently large channel width as described in the specification on page 20, lines 1-3.

In paragraph 2, the Official Action rejects claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,232). Further, in paragraph 4, the Official Action rejects claims 2-5, 8-9 and 11-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Takemura (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,092). In particular, regarding claims 1, 6, 7 and 10, the Examiner indicates that the Yamazaki et al. reference discloses each and every element of the claimed invention except for the feature of the two thin film transistors being connected in parallel. To remedy this admitted deficiency, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect the two thin film transistors in parallel since to do so would enable the unit structure's power output to be increased while reducing its output impedance. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants note that the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness lies with the Patent Office. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be (1) some suggestion or motivation (either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art) to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings to achieve the claimed invention, and (2) the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §2143. Presently, the claimed invention discloses an electro-optical device wherein at least two transistors are connected with each other in parallel and wherein channel-forming regions of the at least two transistors are provided in separate

islands or, alternatively, in a common island. In the Official Action, the Examiner acknowledges the deficiency of the cited Yamazaki et al. reference in teaching the parallel connection between the at least two transistors. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that absent some specific teaching or suggestion in the prior art, the ordinary skilled artisan would not be motivated to modify the device of Yamazaki et al. in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing disclosed in the cited Yamazaki et al. reference teaches or suggest the desirability of increasing the output and decreasing the impedance of the Yamazaki et al. device, as asserted by the Examiner. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office has not met its burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 2-5, 8-9 and 11-57, claims 15 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the remaining claims 2-5, 8-9, 11-14, 16-20 and 22-57 are allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/334,646
Attorney Docket No. 0756-1984

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY LLP



Eric J. Robinson
Registration No. 38,285

EJR:RCC/dkt

Attorney Docket No.: 0756-1984

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone (703) 790-9110

F:\DATA\wp2\CLIENTS\0756\1984\docs\00-05 Amendment.wpd